

The juvenile justice system has historically faced a lack of sufficient funding. Scarcity of funds necessitates making informed, strategic investments to improve efficiency, programming and outcomes for youths in our care.

- Federal funding for juvenile justice programs and initiatives decreased by 38 percent between FY2002 and FY2007.¹
- Budget crises across the country and mounting operation costs of adult and juvenile corrections agencies require an increased focus on efficiency, outcomes and accountability.

The number and availability of evidence-based practices and programs has expanded, giving juvenile justice practitioners proven tools that reduce reoffending, develop competencies, hold youths accountable and enhance public safety.

- The portfolio of evidence-based practices for youths involved in the juvenile justice system includes, but is not limited to, Functional Family Therapy (FFT); Aggression Replacement Training (ART); Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST); Family Integrated Transitions (FIT); Coordination of Services (COS); Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC); Cognitive Behavioral Therapy; Dialectical Behavioral Therapy; and Victim Offender Mediation (VOM).²

Commitment of scarce resources to implementation of effective programming and practices should be viewed as an investment in prevention of future criminal activity.

- A cost analysis of evidence-based programs revealed reductions in future crime that save an average of between \$4,000 and \$77,000 per youth served.³
- A recent review of implementation of FFT and MST in Florida revealed savings of \$5.8 million in custody costs over a two year period.⁴

POSITION STATEMENT

- The Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators (CJCA) strongly supports targeted and strategic investments in juvenile crime prevention programs as part of a comprehensive strategy to enhance public safety and reduce youth violence and crime.
- CJCA strongly recommends investment in evidence-based practices and interventions that have been proven to reduce the risk that youths will reoffend, thus improving outcomes for youths, reducing costs and improving public safety.
- CJCA supports the development of relevant, measurable outcomes to demonstrate the value of investments in experimental, innovative and/or promising intervention approaches.

¹ Nuñez-Neto, B. (2008, February 27). U.S. Congressional Research Service. *Juvenile justice funding trends* (RS22655). Retrieved March 26, 2009, from www.opencrs.com.

² See Aos., S., Miller, M. & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-based public policy options to reduce future prison construction, criminal justice costs, and crime rates*. Olympia, WA. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Retrieved April 7, 2009 from, <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/06-10-1201.pdf> and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Model Programs Guide online at http://www.dsgonline.com/mpg2.5/mpg_index.htm

³ Aos., S., Miller, M. & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-based public policy options to reduce future prison construction, criminal justice costs, and crime rates*. Olympia, WA. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Retrieved April 7, 2009 from, <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/06-10-1201.pdf>

⁴ Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis & Government Accountability. (February 2007). *Redirection pilots meet and exceed residential commitment outcomes: \$5.8 million saved*. 07-10-11, as cited by Fight Crime: Invest in Kids (2009). *Cutting state and local budgets & cutting crime*. Retrieved April 7, 2009, from <http://www.fightcrime.org/reports/NationalTsBrief.pdf>